



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/821,589	04/09/2004	Yosuke Hosoya	09792909-5854	1893

26263 7590 06/03/2008  
SONNENSCHN NATH & ROSENTHAL LLP  
P.O. BOX 061080  
WACKER DRIVE STATION, SEARS TOWER  
CHICAGO, IL 60606-1080

EXAMINER
----------

CANTELMO, GREGG

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1795

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

06/03/2008

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/821,589	<b>Applicant(s)</b> HOSOYA ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> Gregg Cantelmo	<b>Art Unit</b> 1795	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 4/3/08.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)          | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____                                      |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)          | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____  | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                          |

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Response to Amendment***

1. In response to the amendment received April 3, 2008:
  - a. Claims 1-7 are pending;
  - b. The claim objection has been overcome in light of the amendment;
  - c. The prior art rejections stand as modified in light of the amendment.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

2. Claims 1 and 4 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over JP '643, of record.

JP '643 discloses a positive active material comprising: particles of a compound oxide of lithium and a transition metal 1 (figures and paragraphs 10 and 24) having an inherent layered structure thereby permitting the intercalation/deintercalation of lithium during charging/discharging and a coating layer on the active material 1 wherein the coating layer comprises an inorganic lithium compound 4 (paragraphs 10 and 23) and a carbonaceous conductive material 3 (paragraph 10 and 23 as applied to claim 1). The inorganic compound 4 is a lithium compound (paragraph 23 as applied to claim 1). The weight ratio of the particles 1 to the coating 2/3/4 teaches of particle weights of 10 grams relative to about 1 gram of coating material (see examples for weight ratios). Thus JP '643 teaches that the weight ratio of the particles will clearly be at least 70% but less than 98% relative to the coating layer 2/3/4 (as applied to claim 4).

Regarding the coating layer is adhered to the base particles via shearing and compressive stress (claim 1):

Claim 1 is to a product and the limitations of adhering the coating via shearing and compressive stress is a product-by-process type limitation. The prior art structure of JP '642 includes a base particle having a coating of an inorganic compound and a carbonaceous material thereon and thus has the same physical structure as that of claim 1.

“[E]ven though product-by-process claims are limited by and defined by the process, determination of patentability is based on the product itself. The patentability of a product does not depend on its method of production. If the product in the product-by-process claim is the same as or obvious from a product of the prior art, the claim is unpatentable even though the prior product was made by a different process.” In re Thorpe, 777 F.2d 695, 698, 227 USPQ 964, 966 (Fed. Cir. 1985) (citations omitted).

“The Patent Office bears a lesser burden of proof in making out a case of prima facie obviousness for product-by-process claims because of their peculiar nature” than when a product is claimed in the conventional fashion. In re Fessmann, 489 F.2d 742, 744, 180 USPQ 324, 326 (CCPA 1974). Once the Examiner provides a rationale tending to show that the claimed product appears to be the same or similar to that of the prior art, although produced by a different process, the burden shifts to applicant to come forward with evidence establishing an unobvious difference between the claimed product and the prior art product. In re Marosi, 710 F.2d 798, 802, 218 USPQ 289, 292

(Fed. Cir. 1983). Ex parte Gray, 10 USPQ2d 1922 (Bd. Pat. App. & Inter. 1989). See MPEP section 2113.

Thus the prior art composition is held to have the same structure as the active material of claims 1 and 4 and thus the product in the product-by-process of claims 1 and 4 appear to be anticipated by JP '643. Even if any differences were held to be found in the product-by-process of claim 1, such differences would be minor and obvious.

### ***Response to Arguments***

3. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1 and 3 have been considered but are not persuasive.

Applicant argues that the present invention requires the inorganic materials of lithium iron phosphate and lithium phosphate and directs attention to claim 1. This statement is not germane to claim 1 since claim 1 has been amended and no longer limits to these materials (see amended claim 2). Thus arguments to these materials applied to claim 1 are not commensurate with the scope of claim 1 and not persuasive.

Applicant argues that Nagura does not teach or even fairly suggest applying compressive and shear stress on the powder so that the particles of one type adhere to the particles of another type.

This argument is not persuasive.

These arguments are not persuasive since this is a piecemeal analysis of Nagura.

Claim 1 is to a product and the limitations of adhering the coating via shearing and compressive stress is a product-by-process type limitation. The prior art structure of JP '642 includes a base particle having a coating of an inorganic compound and a carbonaceous material thereon and thus has the same physical structure as that of claim 1.

“[E]ven though product-by-process claims are limited by and defined by the process, determination of patentability is based on the product itself. The patentability of a product does not depend on its method of production. If the product in the product-by-process claim is the same as or obvious from a product of the prior art, the claim is unpatentable even though the prior product was made by a different process.” In re Thorpe, 777 F.2d 695, 698, 227 USPQ 964, 966 (Fed. Cir. 1985) (citations omitted).

“The Patent Office bears a lesser burden of proof in making out a case of prima facie obviousness for product-by-process claims because of their peculiar nature” than when a product is claimed in the conventional fashion. In re Fessmann, 489 F.2d 742, 744, 180 USPQ 324, 326 (CCPA 1974). Once the Examiner provides a rationale tending to show that the claimed product appears to be the same or similar to that of the prior art, although produced by a different process, the burden shifts to applicant to come forward with evidence establishing an unobvious difference between the claimed product and the prior art product. In re Marosi, 710 F.2d 798, 802, 218 USPQ 289, 292 (Fed. Cir. 1983). Ex parte Gray, 10 USPQ2d 1922 (Bd. Pat. App. & Inter. 1989). See MPEP section 2113.

Thus the prior art composition is held to have the same structure as the active material of claims 1 and 4 and thus the product in the product-by-process of claims 1 and 4 appear to be anticipated by JP '643. Even if any differences were held to be found in the product-by-process of claim 1, such differences would be minor and obvious.

Additionally, Applicant argues that Nagura does not teach or even fairly suggest that the inorganic lithium compound is selected from the group of  $\text{LiFePO}_4$  and  $\text{Li}_3\text{PO}_4$ .

As discussed above, claim 1 is not limited to these inorganic lithium compounds and any argument to such is not germane to claim 1 and not persuasive.

Applicant argues that Nagura does not teach or even fairly suggest a ratio of the particles to the coating layers.

This argument is not persuasive, since it is a piecemeal analysis of Nagura. Admittedly Nagura does not teach of this feature (recited in claim 3). This argument however, bears no weight to either of claims 1 or 4 since neither claim recites this feature.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

4. Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over JP '643 as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Yamaura, Takada or Mohwald.

The difference between claim 2 and JP '643 is that JP '643 does not teach of the inorganic material being either lithium iron phosphate or lithium phosphate.

Essentially JP '643 teaches of coating lithium metal oxide base particles with a mixture of an inorganic conducting material and an electron conducting material.

While the inorganic conducting materials taught by JP '643 are not inclusive of either lithium iron phosphate or lithium phosphate, JP '643 does teach that the inorganic material is a lithium ion conductive inorganic solid electrolyte material (see abstract). Thus one of ordinary skill in the art would have reasonably appreciated that the inorganic material coated on the positive electrode active material could reasonably be any known teach that the inorganic material is a lithium ion with a reasonable expectation that any such combination would effectively operate in the desired manner taught by JP '643, absent clear evidence to the contrary.

Each of lithium iron phosphate and lithium phosphate are art recognized ion conductive materials used in lithium secondary batteries as shown by either Yamaura (col. 5, ll. 33-37); Takada (col. 1, ll. 32-55); or Mohwald (col. 4, ll. 43-65). Thus it would have been apparent to one of ordinary skill in the art to use either lithium iron phosphate or lithium phosphate as an alternative ion conducting inorganic material coated onto the positive electrode since the primary reference teaches that it is generally known to coat lithium metal oxide base particles with a mixture of a lithium ion conducting inorganic material and an electron conducting material and since the specific inorganic materials of lithium iron phosphate and lithium phosphate are art recognized ion conductive materials used in lithium secondary batteries as shown by either Yamaura, Takada, or Mohwald.



Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the claimed invention was made to modify the teachings of JP '643 by selecting the lithium ion conducting inorganic material to be either lithium iron phosphate or lithium phosphate since such materials are art recognized lithium ion conducting inorganic materials as shown by either Yamaura, Takada, or Mohwald and one of ordinary skill in the art would have found such a modification to have provided the predictable result of providing a coating to the positive active material having both the requisite electron conducting and lithium ion conducting properties. The selection of a known material based on its suitability for its intended use supported a prima facie obviousness determination in *Sinclair & Carroll Co. v. Interchemical Corp.*, 325 U.S. 327, 65 USPQ 297 (1945). See also *In re Leshin*, 227 F.2d 197, 125 USPQ 416 (CCPA 1960). MPEP § 2144.07. See also *KSR International Co. v. Teleflex Inc.*, 82 USPQ2d 1385 (U.S. 2007).

5. Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over JP '643 as applied to claim 1 above.

The difference between claim 3 and JP '643 is that JP '643 does not teach of the weight ratio between the inorganic material to the carbonaceous material being between 99:1 and 60:40.

While JP '643 discloses providing both an inorganic component 4 and carbon component 3 in a coating material to a positive active material 1, the disclosure does not specifically teach of the ratio of these two materials, however it is clear that there is an inherent ratio between these two components.

Varying the amount of each of components 2, 3 and 4 of the coating layer are recognizable optimizable components. One of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that by varying the amount of carbon in the film, the electronic conductivity of film would vary accordingly. One of ordinary skill in the art would have also recognized that by varying the amount of the inorganic lithium compound in the film, the ionic conductivity of the film would vary accordingly. Adjusting the ratios of both materials will optimize the ionic and electronic conductivity of the film and selection of the claimed ratio would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art since it would have provided a coating which exhibited optimal ionic and electronic conductivities.

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the claimed invention was made to modify the teachings of JP '643 by adjusting the ratios of both the carbon component and inorganic component of the film of JP '643 within the ratio defined in claim 3 since the optimization of these would have been a recognized result-effective variable which could have been optimized since it would have provided a coating which exhibited optimal ionic and electronic conductivities.

Generally, differences in ranges will not support the patentability of subject matter encompassed by the prior art unless there is evidence indicating such ranges is critical. In re Boesch, 617 F.2d 272, 205 USPQ 215 (CCPA 1980). In re Aller, 220 F.2d 454, 456, 105 USPQ 233, 235 (CCPA 1955). In re Hoeschele, 406 F.2d 1403, 160 USPQ 809 (CCPA 1969). It has been held that when the difference between a claimed invention and the prior art is the range or value of a particular variable, then a prima

facie rejection is properly established when the difference in the range or value is minor. Titanium Metals Corp. of Am. v. Banner, 778 F.2d 775, 783, 227 USPQ 773, 779 (Fed. Cir. 1985).

### ***Response to Arguments***

6. Applicant's arguments filed April 3, 2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Arguments to Yamaura et al.:

Applicant argues that Yamaura et al. does not teach or even fairly suggest applying compressive and shear stress on the powder so that the particles of one type adhere to the particles of another type.

As discussed above, these limitations are held to be directed to the process of making the product. As a product-by-process claim, the process is not necessarily given patentable weight unless there is clear and convincing evidence that the process imparts a patentable structural difference to the claimed composition. As set forth above, since the prior art product is held to be the same as the claimed product and since there is no evidence to the contrary or evidence that the product made by the process of claim 1 results in a clear patentably distinct product from the prior art product. Thus this argument is not persuasive.

Additionally Applicant argues that Yamaura et al. does not teach or even fairly suggest Li<sub>3</sub>PO<sub>4</sub> or LiFePO<sub>4</sub> as a coating for an active particle.

In response to applicant's arguments against the references individually, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections

Art Unit: 1795

are based on combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.*, 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986). As set forth above, the Examiner sets forth a rationale as to why the combination of references would have reasonably led one of ordinary skill in the art to employ lithium phosphate or lithium iron phosphate as the additive in the ion conducting coating of JP '643. Applicant's piecemeal analysis of the rejection fails to reasonably or convincingly argue this combination. Therefore the rejection stands.

Furthermore, Applicant argues that Yamaura et al. does not teach or even fairly suggest any ratio of the particles to the coating layers.

This argument is not germane, since Yamaura is not relied upon for a teaching of suggestion of the claimed ratio.

Arguments to Takada et al.:

Applicant argues that Takada et al. does not teach or even fairly suggest applying compressive and shear stress on the powder so that the particles of one type adhere to the particles of another type.

As discussed above, these limitations are held to be directed to the process of making the product. As a product-by-process claim, the process is not necessarily given patentable weight unless there is clear and convincing evidence that the process imparts a patentable structural difference to the claimed composition. As set forth above, since the prior art product is held to be the same as the claimed product and since there is no evidence to the contrary or evidence that the product made by the

Art Unit: 1795

process of claim 1 results in a clear patentably distinct product from the prior art product. Thus this argument is not persuasive.

Additionally Applicant argues that Takada et al. does not teach or even fairly suggest  $\text{Li}_3\text{PO}_4$  or  $\text{LiFePO}_4$  as a coating for an active particle.

In response to applicant's arguments against the references individually, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.*, 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986). As set forth above, the Examiner sets forth a rationale as to why the combination of references would have reasonably led one of ordinary skill in the art to employ lithium phosphate or lithium iron phosphate as the additive in the ion conducting coating of JP '643. Applicant's piecemeal analysis of the rejection fails to reasonably or convincingly argue this combination. Therefore the rejection stands.

Furthermore, Applicant argues that Takada et al. does not teach or even fairly suggest any ratio of the particles to the coating layers.

This argument is not germane, since Takada is not relied upon for a teaching of suggestion of the claimed ratio.

Arguments to Mohwald et al.:

Applicant argues that Mohwald et al. does not teach or even fairly suggest applying compressive and shear stress on the powder so that the particles of one type adhere to the particles of another type.

As discussed above, these limitations are held to be directed to the process of making the product. As a product-by-process claim, the process is not necessarily given patentable weight unless there is clear and convincing evidence that the process imparts a patentable structural difference to the claimed composition. As set forth above, since the prior art product is held to be the same as the claimed product and since there is no evidence to the contrary or evidence that the product made by the process of claim 1 results in a clear patentably distinct product from the prior art product. Thus this argument is not persuasive.

Additionally Applicant argues that Mohwald et al. does not teach or even fairly suggest  $\text{Li}_3\text{PO}_4$  or  $\text{LiFePO}_4$  as a coating for an active particle.

In response to applicant's arguments against the references individually, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.*, 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986). As set forth above, the Examiner sets forth a rationale as to why the combination of references would have reasonably led one of ordinary skill in the art to employ lithium phosphate or lithium iron phosphate as the additive in the ion conducting coating of JP '643. Applicant's piecemeal analysis of the rejection fails to reasonably or convincingly argue this combination. Therefore the rejection stands.

Furthermore, Applicant argues that Mohwald et al. does not teach or even fairly suggest any ratio of the particles to the coating layers.

This argument is not germane, since Mohwald is not relied upon for a teaching of suggestion of the claimed ratio.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

7. Claims 5-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over JP '643, of record, in view of either U.S. Patent No. 4,668,594 (Yamaura); U.S. Patent No. 5,958,281 (Takada) or U.S. Patent No. 6,475,663 (Mohwald).

JP '643 discloses a positive active material comprising: particles of a compound oxide of lithium and a transition metal 1 (figures and paragraphs 10 and 24) having an inherent layered structure thereby permitting the intercalation/deintercalation of lithium during charging/discharging and a coating layer on the active material 1 wherein the coating layer comprises an inorganic lithium compound 4 (paragraphs 10 and 23) and a carbonaceous conductive material 3 (paragraph 10 and 23 as applied to claim 5). The inorganic compound 4 is a lithium compound (paragraph 23 as applied to claim 5). The weight ratio of the particles 1 to the coating 2/3/4 teaches of particle weights of 10 grams relative to about 1 gram of coating material (see examples for weight ratios). Thus JP '643 teaches that the weight ratio of the particles will clearly be at least 70% but less than 98% relative to the coating layer 2/3/4 (as applied to claim 7).

JP '643 discloses a nonaqueous secondary battery comprising: a negative active material and a positive active material comprising: particles of a compound oxide of lithium and a transition metal 1 (figures and paragraphs 10 and 24) having an inherent layered structure thereby permitting the intercalation/deintercalation of lithium during charging/discharging and a coating layer on the active material 1 wherein the coating

layer comprises an inorganic lithium compound 4 (paragraphs 10 and 23) and a carbonaceous conductive material 3 (paragraph 10 and 23 as applied to claim 5).

JP '643 does not specify that the inorganic material is either lithium iron phosphate or lithium phosphate (claim 5) or the weight ratio between the inorganic material to the carbonaceous material being between 99:1 and 60:40 (claim 6).

Regarding the inorganic material being either lithium iron phosphate or lithium phosphate (claim and 5):

Essentially JP '643 teaches of coating lithium metal oxide base particles with a mixture of an inorganic conducting material and an electron conducting material.

While the inorganic conducting materials taught by JP '643 are not inclusive of either lithium iron phosphate or lithium phosphate, JP '643 does teach that the inorganic material is a lithium ion conductive inorganic solid electrolyte material (see abstract). Thus one of ordinary skill in the art would have reasonably appreciated that the inorganic material coated on the positive electrode active material could reasonably be any known teach that the inorganic material is a lithium ion with a reasonable expectation that any such combination would effectively operate in the desired manner taught by JP '643, absent clear evidence to the contrary.

Each of lithium iron phosphate and lithium phosphate are art recognized ion conductive materials used in lithium secondary batteries as shown by either Yamaura (col. 5, ll. 33-37); Takada (col. 1, ll. 32-55); or Mohwald (col. 4, ll. 43-65). Thus it would have been apparent to one of ordinary skill in the art to use either lithium iron phosphate or lithium phosphate as an alternative ion conducting inorganic material coated onto the



Art Unit: 1795

positive electrode since the primary reference teaches that it is generally known to coat lithium metal oxide base particles with a mixture of a lithium ion conducting inorganic material and an electron conducting material and since the specific inorganic materials of lithium iron phosphate and lithium phosphate are art recognized ion conductive materials used in lithium secondary batteries as shown by either Yamaura, Takada, or Mohwald.

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the claimed invention was made to modify the teachings of JP '643 by selecting the lithium ion conducting inorganic material to be either lithium iron phosphate or lithium phosphate since such materials are art recognized lithium ion conducting inorganic materials as shown by either Yamaura, Takada, or Mohwald and one of ordinary skill in the art would have found such a modification to have provided the predictable result of providing a coating to the positive active material having both the requisite electron conducting and lithium ion conducting properties. The selection of a known material based on its suitability for its intended use supported a prima facie obviousness determination in *Sinclair & Carroll Co. v. Interchemical Corp.*, 325 U.S. 327, 65 USPQ 297 (1945). See also *In re Leshin*, 227 F.2d 197, 125 USPQ 416 (CCPA 1960). MPEP § 2144.07. See also *KSR International Co. v. Teleflex Inc.*, 82 USPQ2d 1385 (U.S. 2007).

Regarding the weight ratio between the inorganic material to the carbonaceous material being between 99:1 and 60:40 (claim 6):

While JP '643 discloses providing both an inorganic component 4 and carbon component 3 in a coating material to a positive active material 1, the disclosure does not specifically teach of the ratio of these two materials, however it is clear that there is an inherent ratio between these two components.

Varying the amount of each of components 2, 3 and 4 of the coating layer are recognizable optimizable components. One of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that by varying the amount of carbon in the film, the electronic conductivity of film would vary accordingly. One of ordinary skill in the art would have also recognized that by varying the amount of the inorganic lithium compound in the film, the ionic conductivity of the film would vary accordingly. Adjusting the ratios of both materials will optimize the ionic and electronic conductivity of the film and selection of the claimed ratio would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art since it would have provided a coating which exhibited optimal ionic and electronic conductivities.

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the claimed invention was made to modify the teachings of JP '643 by adjusting the ratios of both the carbon component and inorganic component of the film of JP '643 within the ratio defined in claim 6 since the optimization of these would have been a recognized result-effective variable which could have been optimized since it would have provided a coating which exhibited optimal ionic and electronic conductivities.

Generally, differences in ranges will not support the patentability of subject matter encompassed by the prior art unless there is evidence indicating such ranges is

Art Unit: 1795

critical. In re Boesch, 617 F.2d 272, 205 USPQ 215 (CCPA 1980). In re Aller, 220 F.2d 454, 456, 105 USPQ 233, 235 (CCPA 1955). In re Hoeschele, 406 F.2d 1403, 160 USPQ 809 (CCPA 1969). It has been held that when the difference between a claimed invention and the prior art is the range or value of a particular variable, then a prima facie rejection is properly established when the difference in the range or value is minor. Titanium Metals Corp. of Am. v. Banner, 778 F.2d 775, 783, 227 USPQ 773, 779 (Fed. Cir. 1985).

### ***Response to Arguments***

8. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 5-7 have been considered but are not persuasive for reasons set forth above in the prior Response to Arguments, incorporated herein.

### ***Conclusion***

9. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

Art Unit: 1795

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Gregg Cantelmo whose telephone number is 571-272-1283. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Thursday, 8:30-6:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Pat Ryan can be reached on 571-272-1292. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Gregg Cantelmo/  
Examiner of Art Unit 1795